DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 160 HE 007 581

AUTHOR Atelsek Frank J.; Gomberg, Irene L.
TITLE Student Assistance: Participants and Programs 1974-75. Higher Education Panel Reports, No. 27.
INSTITUTION American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Institutes of Health (DHEW), Bethesda, Md.; National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 75
NOTE 47p.
AVAILABLE FROM Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 (free)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Finance; *Higher Education; Incentive Grants; *Participant Characteristics; *Student Costs; *Student Financial Aid; Student Loan Programs; Surveys; Tables (Data); Tuition Grants; Work Study Programs
IDENTIFIERS Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program; College Work Study Program; Guaranteed Student Loan Program; National Direct Student Loan Program; State Student Incentive Grant Program; Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program

ABSTRACT

This survey was designed to collect information for the 1974-75 academic year on the extent of student participation in Office of Education programs, the characteristics of aid recipients, student charges and the amounts and sources of student aid available at institutions of higher education, and to elicit suggestions for improving the operation of federal student aid programs. The six programs for which data were requested are: (1) Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program (BEOG); (2) Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program (SEOG); (3) State Student Incentive Grant Program (SSIG); (4) College Work-Study Program (CWS); (5) National Direct Student Loan Program (NDSL); and (6) Guaranteed Student Loan Program (GSL). The survey questionnaire was sent to all 644 members of the Higher Education Panel of the American Council on Education. Suggestions for improvement fell into two main headings: administration and program design. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED121160

Student Assistance: Participants and Programs 1974-75

Frank J. Atelsek and Irene L. Gomberg

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 007 581

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL REPORTS, NUMBER 27
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

DECEMBER
1975

2

A Survey Funded by the National Science Foundation, the U. S. Office of Education, and the National Institutes of Health.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Roger W. Heyns, *President*

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918, is a council of educational organizations and institutions. Its purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions.

The Higher Education Panel is a survey research program established by the Council for the purpose of securing policy-related information quickly from representative samples of colleges and universities. *Higher Education Panel Reports* are designed to expedite communication of the Panel's survey findings to policy-makers in government, in the associations, and in educational institutions across the nation.

The Higher Education Panel's surveys on behalf of the Federal Government are conducted under grant support provided jointly by the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and the U. S. Office of Education (NSF Grant SRS-7517251).

STAFF OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL

Frank J. Atelsek, *Panel Director*

Irene L. Gomberg, *Senior Research Analyst*

Nabil Issa, *Programmer*

Elaine Chamberlain, *Project Secretary*

HEP ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Lyle H. Lanier, Director, Office of Administrative Affairs and Educational Statistics, ACE, *Chairman*

John A. Creager, Director, Division of Educational Statistics, ACE

W. Todd Furniss, Director, Office of Academic Affairs, ACE

John F. Hughes, Director, Policy Analysis Service, ACE

Charles V. Kidd, Executive Secretary, Association of American Universities

J. Boyd Page, President, Council of Graduate Schools in the United States

FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Charles E. Falk, National Science Foundation, *Chairman*
Richard A. Giza, National Institutes of Health (Acting)
George E. Hall, Office of Management and Budget
Richard T. Sonnergren, U. S. Office of Education
Felix H. Lindsay, National Science Foundation, *Secretary*

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARD

Martin Frankel, U. S. Office of Education, *Chairman*
Nancy M. Conlon, National Science Foundation
Tavia Gordon, National Institutes of Health

Additional copies of this report are available from the Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE:
PARTICIPANTS AND PROGRAMS, 1974-75

Frank J. Atelsek
Irene L. Gomberg

Higher Education Panel Reports
Number 27 December 1975

American Council on Education
Washington, D.C. 20036

Acknowledgments

As with all Panel surveys this report on student assistance programs reflects the efforts of many persons and groups. In particular, we wish to acknowledge Richard Sonnergren of the Office of Education, and the staff of the Policy Analysis Service at the American Council on Education for their considerable help in shaping the survey instrument and the content of the report. The survey also benefited from suggestions offered by the members of the HEP advisory groups (listed on the inside cover of this report).

Computer-related services were ably provided by Nabil Issa and Clay Henderson. Laura Kent edited the manuscript, and Elaine Chamberlain typed and patiently guided it from rough draft to final form.

Finally, as always, our special thanks are due our Panel representatives and the financial aid officials at the responding colleges and universities. We hope the results are useful to them.

Highlights

Description of Students Assisted

- 1.6 million students received aid through Office of Education assistance programs: 371,000 attended two-year colleges, 839,000 attended four-year institutions, and 374,000 attended universities.
- 95 percent of all aid recipients were undergraduates; 5 percent were graduate students.
- One-third of the assisted students were minority-group members.
- More than two-fifths of the dependent undergraduates receiving aid were from families with gross incomes of less than $7,500.

Use of Assistance Programs

- 3,188,000 separate awards were made under the six OE programs:

Program	No. of Awards	Average Award
Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG)	543,000	$ 620
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG)	350,000	540
State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG)	302,000	600
College Work-Study (CWS)	575,000	560
National Direct Student Loan (NDSL)	749,000	690
Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL)	669,000	1,250

- Minority students received almost half of the BEOG and SEOG awards but only about one-fifth of the SSIG and GSL awards.
- Undergraduates from higher-income families ($12,000 or more) and graduate students accounted for more than half of the GSL loans.
- BEOG and SEOG recipients were more often enrolled in public institutions whereas NDSL and GSL recipients were more often enrolled in private institutions.

Costs of Attending

- On the average, basic student costs (tuition and fees plus room and board) were two and one-half times greater at private than at public institutions (private $3,340; public $1,390).
- Tuition costs accounted for most of this difference, being five times greater at private than at public institutions.

- In the private sector, institutions with smaller proportions of students receiving need-based aid reported higher-than-average tuition charges; those with relatively large proportions of students receiving need-based aid reported tuition rates well below average. The opposite pattern prevailed among public institutions.

Sources of Student Aid

- According to institutional revenue accounts, an estimated $3.9 billion was available for student aid from all sources, almost 10 percent of $40 billion in expenditures in 1974-75.[1]

- Of this $3.9 billion, 39 percent came from federal sources; 33 percent came from the institutions themselves, either directly through grants or indirectly through tuition waivers and remissions of other fees; 20 percent came from state and local government sources; and 9 percent came from private donors.

- Private institutions drew more heavily from their own funds for student aid (two-fifths of the funds available for such aid) than did public institutions.

- Two-year colleges were particularly dependent on federal sources, which provided well over two-thirds of student aid funds at the public, and over half at the private, two-year colleges.

[1] Expenditure data from The Condition of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Education Division (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office), 1975, p. 90.

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Methods Summary	3
Findings	4
Characteristics of Aid Recipients	4
Costs of Attending	7
Average Assistance Awards	8
Sources of Student Aid	8
Suggestions for Improvement	10
References	11
Tables	13
Appendices	
A. Survey Instrument	29
B. Weighting Procedures	37
C. Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents	43

STUDENT ASSISTANCE: PARTICIPANTS AND PROGRAMS, 1974-75

Frank J. Atelsek and Irene L. Gomberg

About eighteen months ago, the Higher Education Panel reported the results of a survey on the Impact of Office of Education Student Assistance Programs, Fall, 1973 (Survey Report Number 18, April 1974). All member institutions were asked about student participation in the (then) five Office of Education aid programs, student enrollment and charges for the current and preceding years, and the institutions' experiences with the programs.

As enrollments in higher education shift -- particularly among minority groups, women, and dependent students from low-income families -- and as the costs of attendance continue to rise, it becomes imperative to reexamine OE student assistance programs (now six in number). Thus, at the request of the Office of Education, a second survey, reported here, was undertaken in the spring of 1975.

HEP Survey #27 was designed to collect information, for the 1974-75 academic year, on the extent of student participation in OE programs, the characteristics of aid recipients, student charges, and the amounts and sources of student aid available at institutions of higher education, and to elicit suggestions for improving the operation of federal student aid programs.

The six programs for which data were requested are:

Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program (BEOG): Authorized by the 1972 Education Amendments, BEOG provides direct grants to both part-time and full-time students. The maximum award is $1,400, minus an expected family contribution based on income and assets; the minimum award is $200. At no time may the grant exceed one-half the actual cost of attendance (tuition and fees, room and board, books, expenses). Freshmen students were eligible during the program's first year of operation (1973-74), and with each succeeding year an additional class has become eligible. Thus full funding is anticipated during 1976-77.

Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program (SEOG): The SEOG program, in existence for ten years, is one of three campus-based student aid programs. "Campus-based" means that the funds are given directly to the participating institutions which, in turn, select students with "exceptional" financial need. The awards may be as great as one-half the total amount of student financial aid provided by the institution but may not exceed $1,500 annually.

State Student Incentive Grant Program (SSIG): Enacted under the 1972 Education Amentments, the SSIG program began operating in 1974-75. Appropriations are made available to participating states and territories[2] on a 50-50 matching basis, with states agreeing to maintain previously established funding levels. Awards up to $1,500 yearly are given to undergraduates who have substantial financial need and who meet specifically defined state requirements.[3]

College Work-Study Program (CWS): Under this campus-based financial aid program created in 1964, institutions receive funds to pay 80 percent of the wages of students working on or off-campus in either public or non-profit organizations. Students must be enrolled at least half-time, and their earnings are limited to an amount no greater than the difference between their assessed financial need and the amount of other financial aid.

National Direct Student Loan Program (NDSL): The oldest of the aid programs, NDSL was enacted in 1958 as the National Defense Student Loan Program. Participating institutions provide 10 percent matching funds for this low-interest (3 percent), campus-based loan program. Undergraduates may borrow a maximum of $5,000; graduate students are limited to $10,000, including loans for undergraduate study. There is a ten-year repayment period, beginning nine months after the borrower ceases full-time or half-time study. Up to 100 percent of the loan may be cancelled if the borrower takes a teaching job in an economically deprived area or teaches the handicapped; up to 50 percent of the loan may be cancelled if the borrower serves in the Armed Forces in an area of hostilities.

Guaranteed Student Loan Program (GSL): Under the GSL program, loans are made directly by the lending institutions and guaranteed by the federal government or by state agencies. Undergraduates may borrow a total of $7,500, and graduates a total of $10,000. During the repayment period, which runs between five and ten years, interest is payable at the rate of 7 percent. For students who qualify, interest is paid by the federal government during in-school, grace, and specified deferment periods.

---

[2]Fifteen out of 57 eligible jurisdictions did not participate in 1974-75.

[3]Because of the newness of this program, and because of varying accounting methods, many institutions were unable to separate the federal SSIG money from other, purely state, scholarship money in responding to this survey. Therefore, according to recent Office of Education data, the number of recipients reported here is more than double the actual number (302,000 vs. 135,000), and the average award reported is probably 25 percent higher than the actual ($600 vs. $480). (Information obtained through telephone conversations with the Director, SSIG Program.)

Methods Summary

The Higher Education Panel is a continuing survey research program established by the American Council on Education in 1971 for the purpose of conducting quick-turnaround surveys on topics of current policy interest to the higher education community and to government agencies. The Panel is based upon a network of campus representatives at 644 institutions broadly representative of the more than three thousand colleges and universities listed in the Office of Education's Education Directory 1973-74. All institutions in the population are categorized in terms of the variables constituting the Panel's stratification design, based primarily on type, control, and enrollment (see Appendix B, Table B-1).

The survey questionnaire (see Appendix A) was mailed to all 644 Panel members with a request that the institution's financial aid officer complete the form. By the end of June 1975, the deadline for questionnaire returns, usable responses had been received from 505, or 78.8 percent of the sampled institutions[4]. Appendix C (Table C-1) gives a detailed comparison of respondents and nonrespondents.

The data from responding institutions were statistically adjusted to represent the national population of 3,021 colleges and universities. Specifically, each data item was weighted, within each stratification cell, by the ratio of the number of institutions in the eligible population to the number of Panel institutions in that cell which responded to the particular survey item. (For a full discussion of the weighting procedure, see Appendix B.) Therefore the data displayed in the tables by various institutional categories apply to the total number of institutions in the United States, as indicated in Appendix Table B-2[5].

---

[4] Three service academies were later excluded because their students were wholly supported by the federal government; thus the sample N=641.

[5] It should be noted that there is an extremely low representation of two-year colleges in this survey (5 percent of public, 9 percent of private). Therefore, caution should be exercised in interpreting the data relative to them.

Findings

This report describes the weighted results of the survey, grouping institutions by type (two-year colleges, four-year colleges, universities) and control (public, private). In Table 1, comparative data on the enrollments and demographic characteristics of full-time students are given to provide the reader with a point of reference. It should be noted, for example, that in fall 1974:

- Three in four of the 6.4 million full-time students were enrolled in public institutions
- Approximately 12 percent were members of minority groups (estimates based on 1972 enrollment data)
- About 57 percent of the students were men
- Fewer than one-fourth were enrolled in two-year colleges
- Graduate students made up less than one-eighth of the total enrollment.

Characteristics of Aid Recipients

Of the estimated 6.4 million full-time students enrolled in the nation's colleges and universities at the beginning of the 1974-75 academic year, about one in four (1.6 million) received aid from one or more of the six Office of Education programs under consideration. Of these aid recipients, just over one million (almost two-thirds) attended public institutions, and 551,000 were in private institutions (Table 2). By type of institution, over half of the aid recipients (839,000) were enrolled in four-year colleges, about equally divided between public and private; slightly under a quarter (371,000) were enrolled in two-year colleges, 90 percent of them in public colleges; and another quarter (374,000) were enrolled in universities, three-fourths of them in public institutions.

Minority-Group Membership. About one in three assisted students was a member of a minority group (Black Americans, American Indians, Asian-Americans, or

Spanish-surnamed Americans). In public institutions, 38 percent of the aid recipients were minority students, compared with 25 percent in private institutions (Table 3). Almost half of the aid recipients enrolled at public two-year colleges were minority students, whereas at the private two-year colleges, only one-fourth were minority-group members. Similarly, minority students constituted a larger proportion of aid recipients at public (38 percent) than at private (25 percent) four-year institutions. The figure for aid recipients who were minority students was the same at public and at private universities: one in four.

Minority participation varied considerably from one program to another. For example, almost half of those receiving BEOG and SEOG awards -- but only one-fifth of the SSIG and GSL recipients -- were minority students (Table 4), though at private two-year colleges and public universities, they accounted for a markedly smaller share (ranging from 31 to 41 percent) of the BEOG and SEOG awards (Tables 5 and 6). In the College Work-Study (CWS) program, minority participation ranged from 27 to 33 percent at all types of public and private institutions except for the public two-year colleges, where minority involvement was much heavier (45 percent) (Table 7). Minority students were less likely to participate in the Guaranteed Student Loan program than in any other OE assistance programs, accounting for fewer than one in five such loans at both public and private institutions (Table 9).

Sex Distribution. Although only 43 percent of all full-time students attending the nation's colleges and universities in 1974-75 were women, they constituted 51 percent of the aid recipients. This proportion varied among types of institutions, from a high of 57 percent at public two-year colleges to a low of 43 percent at private universities (Table 3).

The participation of women varied among the individual programs as well. For instance, women received about 54 percent of the BEOG and SEOG grants and work-study awards and about half of the SSIG grants and NDSL loans; but only 46 percent

of the GSL loans were taken by women (Table 4).

Family Income Status. More than three in four aid recipients were dependent undergraduates (that is, they received substantial support from their families); one in five was an independent undergraduate; and one in twenty was a graduate student (Table 3). Of the aid recipients classified as dependent undergraduates, 43 percent came from families with gross incomes under $7,500; 32 percent from families with incomes ranging between $7,500 and $11,999; and 25 percent from families with incomes of $12,000 or more[6].

While dependent undergraduates were strong participants in all six aid programs, the student's family income level was related to participation in the individual programs. Thus, lower-income (gross family income under $7,500) dependent undergraduates were more likely to benefit from need-based grants and less likely to take GSL loans; middle-income ($7,500-$11,999) dependent undergraduates were equally involved in all programs except GSL; and higher-income ($12,000 or more) dependent undergraduates received little help from grants programs but were involved in the loan programs and in College Work-Study (Table 4).

In addition, there were variations by institutional type and control. For example, lower-income dependent students accounted for at least half of the BEOG and SEOG awards in practically all institutional settings, their participation being highest in public four-year colleges (Tables 5 and 6). Higher-income dependent students were particularly likely to be involved in CWS if they attended a private institution: 28 percent of CWS participants at private institutions were in this category, compared with 11 percent at public institutions (Table 7). A similar pattern is evident with respect to the National Direct Student Loan program: Higher-income dependent undergraduates accounted for almost one-third of the NDSL

[6]Note that the text often refers to dependent undergraduates distributed by family income, whereas the tables distribute aid recipients by the five status categories rather than family income alone.

loans at private institutions, compared with only 14 percent at public institutions (Table 8). The participation of higher-income dependent undergraduates in the GSL program was twice as great in public institutions, and three times as great in the private institutions, as the participation of lower-income dependent students.

Overall, three in ten of the aid recipients at private institutions (more than twice as many as recipients at public institutions) were dependent undergraduates from higher-income families, a difference explained in part by the substantially higher costs (for tuition and living expenses) at private institutions (see below and Table 10).

Graduate Students and Independent Undergraduates. Although in the aggregate only one in twenty aid recipients was enrolled in a graduate program, graduate students made relatively heavy use of the GSL program, especially at private universities, where they accounted for almost two-fifths of the estimated 95,000 GSL loans (Table 9). (It should be noted that graduate students are eligible for only three of the six OE assistance programs considered in the survey.)

Independent undergraduate students tended to participate in all six programs in close proportion to their representation among aid recipients. The proportion of these students receiving aid at public institutions was more than double the proportion at private institutions (22 percent vs. 9 percent).

Costs of Attending

For the 1974-75 academic year, basic tuition combined with room and board costs for in-state students attending public institutions averaged just under $1,400. The average costs at private institutions were more than $3,300 (Table 10). Student charges varied substantially by type of institution, with public two-year colleges being least costly ($1,220) and private universities most expensive ($4,060). Differences in costs are attributable chiefly to differential tuition rates, which averaged five times higher at private than at public two-year colleges and four

times higher at private than at public four-year colleges and universities.

As Table 10 indicates, tuition costs were closely related to the attendance levels of need-based aid recipients. Among public institutions, the higher the proportion of students receiving need-based assistance, the higher the mean tuition charge (ranging from $300 at institutions enrolling fewer than 20 percent of these students to $610 at institutions enrolling 80 percent or more). The opposite relationship obtained, however, at private institutions: That is, those with small proportions of students receiving need-based assistance had substantially higher average tuitions than did those with large proportions of such students. These findings suggest that (1) at those public institutions where tuition costs were nominal, the full complement of eligible students did not apply for aid (it may be that eligible students elected to attend higher-cost public institutions); and (2) eligible students at private institutions were more likely to attend those with lower tuition rates.

Average Assistance Awards

Assistance awards ranged from an average of $540 in the SEOG program to an average of $1,250 in the GSL program (Table 11). In all but the CWS program, average awards were substantially higher at private than at public institutions. Average awards in four of the six assistance programs (BEOG, SEOG, NDSL, and GSL) were lowest at public two-year institutions.

Sources of Student Aid

Respondents were asked to estimate the dollar amount of student aid available through their institutions during the 1974-75 academic year, excluding programs which involved their institutions only indirectly (e.g., Guaranteed Student Loans, Veterans Educational Benefits) and which were not a part of their revenue or expenditure accounts. Their estimates included grants, loans, work-study, fellowships and all other funds whose principal purpose was to aid undergraduate or graduate students.

As Table 12 indicates, a total of approximately $3.9 billion in student aid funds was available among the 3,021 institutions in the population. The 1,443 public institutions accounted for just over $2 billion, about 47 percent of those student aid resources being federal in origin, compared with only 30 percent of those reported by the private institutions. The private institutions, on the other hand, drew more heavily on internal resources, their general funds providing four of every ten dollars available for student aid. More than three-fourths of this amount was given directly through grants, loans, work-study payments, etc., and approximately one-fourth was given in the form of tuition waivers and remissions. In the public sector, institutional general funds accounted for only 26 percent of student aid resources. Public and private institutions received about the same proportions of student aid funds from state and local governments (20 percent) and from private donors (slightly less than 10 percent).

Looking at the distribution of student aid funding sources, we find that, overall, the two-year colleges accounted for 11 percent, the four-year colleges for slightly more than one-half (53 percent), and the universities for the remaining 36 percent. Of student enrollments, however, these institutional types accounted for 24 percent, 45 percent, and 32 percent, respectively. The federal government was the predominant source of student aid funds for all the institutional categories except private four-year colleges and private universities, where institutional sources made up a larger proportion of the funds. This was particularly the case at private universities, where combined institutional sources provided 45 percent of the available aid, compared with only 27 percent from federal sources. The two-year institutions (both public and private) were distinctive in several respects: Federal funds made up a far greater share of their aid resources than those of four-year colleges and universities. Concomitantly institutional sources and private donors combined accounted for only a small share (18 percent public; 26

percent private), compared with four-year institutions (32 percent public; 48 percent private) and universities (44 percent public; 54 percent private).

Suggestions for Improvement

The survey invited the responding aid officers to give suggestions for improving student aid at their institutions. Specifically, they were asked: "Apart from increasing funding levels, what major change(s) or modification(s) in federal policy would best contribute to improving student assistance at your institution?" Nearly half of the survey respondents offered more than 450 separate suggestions, which were classified under two main headings: administration and program design (Table 13).

The most frequently mentioned administrative issues were receiving earlier notification of program funding levels (62 institutions) and having commom application forms and requirements for all campus-based programs (43 institutions). In addition public colleges and universities were particularly interested in the provision of administrative allowances for non-campus-based programs and in more rapid processing of BEOG awards and payments.

In the area of program changes, it was frequently suggested that the needs formula be made uniform for all programs (31 institutions). Moreover, public institutions were apt to recommend that it be made easier to transfer funds between campus-based programs and that carryover of funds be permitted; that various work restrictions under the College Work-Study program be eliminated; and that BEOG money be transferred into the three campus-based programs. Whereas 14 of the public institutions indicated concern about various groups of low-income, independent, and graduate students, 13 of the private institutions focused their comments on the need to make more aid available to middle-income students.

References

Bureau of Postsecondary Education, Office of Education. Factbook. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1974.

Consortium on Financing Higher Education. Federal Student Assistance: A Review of Title IV of the Higher Education Act. Hanover, New Hampshire, April, 1975.

El-Khawas, Elaine H., and Kinzer, Joan L. The Impact of Office of Education Student Assistance Programs, Fall, 1973. HEP Report No. 18. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1974.

Gladieux, Lawrence E. Distribution of Federal Student Assistance: The Enigma of the Two-Year Colleges. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1975.

National Center for Education Statistics, Education Division. The Condition of Education. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

Office of Civil Rights. Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data for Institutions of Higher Education, Fall, 1972. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Tables

Table 1

Comparative Demographic Characteristics
Full-Time Students

Characteristics	Total Institutions		Public Institutions		Private Institutions	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Students	6,430,770	100.0	4,761,091	100.0	1,669,679	100.0
Female	2,754,758	42.8	2,046,755	43.0	708,003	42.4
Male	3,676,012	57.2	2,714,336	57.0	961,676	57.6
Minority	736,642	12.0	571,045	12.5	165,597	10.5
Nonminority	5,391,665	88.0	3,990,146	87.5	1,401,519	89.5
Undergraduates	5,057,950	86.9	3,737,743	88.5	1,320,20	82.7
First professional	216,329	3.7	99,464	2.4	116,865	7.3
Graduate students	427,603	7.4	295,343	7.0	132,260	8.3
Not classified	115,514	2.0	89,055	2.1	26,459	1.7
Universities						
Total	2,028,762	100.0	1,538,901	100.0	489,861	100.0
Female	812,453	40.0	633,539	41.2	178,914	36.5
Male	1,216,309	60.0	905,362	58.8	310,947	63.5
Four-Year Colleges						
Total	2,867,846	100.0	1,786,468	100.0	1,081,378	100.0
Female	1,298,380	45.3	823,171	46.1	475,209	43.9
Male	1,569,466	54.7	963,297	53.9	606,169	56.1
Two-Year Colleges						
Total	1,534,162	100.0	1,435,722	100.0	98,440	100.0
Female	643,925	42.0	590,045	41.1	53,880	54.7
Male	890,237	58.0	845,677	58.9	44,560	45.3

Note: Data pertaining to minority status were obtained from Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education Fall 1972, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1974. Data pertaining to level of study are HEGIS 1974 opening fall enrollment data and were obtained by telephone. They include only the fifty states and the District of Columbia and therefore do not add to the reported totals, which also include outlying areas and territories. All other data come from summary tables showing 1974 opening fall enrollment in higher education, National Center for Education Statistics, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, prepublication release, November 1974.

Table 2

Percent Distribution of Students Receiving Aid Under Office of Education Assistance Programs, by Control and Type of Institution, 1974-75

Institutional Characteristics	Total[a] (Unduplicated Count)	BEOG Recipients	SEOG Recipients	SSIG[b] Recipients	CWS Recipients	NDSL Recipients	GSL Recipients
Total	1,584,000	543,000	350,000	302,000	575,000	749,000	669,000
Control							
Public	65.2	77.3	68.7	48.7	63.0	56.8	56.4
Private	34.8	22.7	31.3	51.3	37.0	43.2	43.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Type							
Public Two-Year	21.1	38.8	21.2	13.1	18.3	7.9	5.2
Private Two-Year	2.3	3.1	2.1	3.2	2.6	2.2	1.4
Public Four-Year	26.5	26.5	31.3	17.1	30.5	28.0	27.5
Private Four-Year	26.5	16.3	24.7	38.2	29.0	32.2	28.0
Public University	17.7	12.0	16.2	18.5	14.1	20.9	23.7
Private University	5.9	3.3	4.5	10.0	5.4	8.8	14.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[a]Excludes Guaranteed Student Loan Program.

[b]All numbers pertaining to the SSIG recipients are inflated since many institutions were unable to report these recipients separately. The reported numbers include many students (more than half) who receive only state funds and no federal scholarship support.

NOTE: All tables show weighted national estimates unless specifically stated otherwise. On this and subsequent tables, numbers of recipients are rounded to the nearest thousand.

Totals may not add due to rounding.

Table 3

Characteristics of All Students (Unduplicated Count)[a] Receiving Aid Under Office of Education Assistance Programs, by Type and Control of Institution, 1974-75
(In Percentages)

Characteristics	Total Institutions	Public Institutions				Private Institutions			
		Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University	Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University
Total	1,584,000	1,034,000	335,000	419,000	280,000	551,000	36,000	420,000	94,000
Ethnic Group									
Minority	33.6	38.3	49.4	38.0	24.7	24.8	25.5	24.8	24.7
Nonminority	66.4	61.7	50.6	62.0	75.3	75.2	74.5	75.2	75.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sex									
Female	51.0	52.3	56.5	50.6	49.3	48.7	50.0	49.9	42.6
Male	49.0	47.7	43.5	49.4	50.7	51.3	50.0	50.1	57.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Status									
Dependent Undergraduates									
Family Income									
Less than $7,500	33.3	35.6	33.0	41.8	31.3	28.2	38.0	28.6	22.7
$7,500 - $11,999	24.8	24.4	24.5	23.6	25.3	25.8	31.1	26.3	21.6
More than $11,999	19.1	14.0	12.9	13.6	16.5	30.0	21.0	32.2	24.4
Independent Undergraduates	18.0	22.0	29.6	16.2	17.4	9.3	9.9	8.5	12.4
Graduate Students	4.8	3.9	----	4.8	9.5	6.8	----	4.5	18.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[a]Excludes Guaranteed Student Loan program.

Table 4

Percentage of Students Receiving Aid Under Office of Education Assistance Programs, by Selected Characteristics of Recipients, 1974-75

Characteristics	Total[a] (Unduplicated Count)	BEOG Recipients	SEOG Recipients	SSIG[b] Recipients	CWS Recipients	NDSL Recipients	GSL Recipients
Total	1,584,000	543,000	350,000	302,000	575,000	749,000	669,000
Ethnic Group							
Minority	33.6	48.1	47.8	21.0	32.6	28.9	18.0
Nonminority	66.4	52.0	52.3	79.0	67.5	71.1	82.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sex							
Female	51.0	54.5	54.1	49.6	54.0	49.6	45.8
Male	49.0	45.5	45.9	50.4	46.0	50.4	54.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Status							
Dependent Undergraduates							
Family Income							
Less than $7,500	33.3	53.5	54.3	34.8	38.5	30.8	13.5
$7,500 - $11,999	24.8	25.3	22.4	27.5	25.9	24.7	18.2
More than $11,999	19.1	7.3	5.3	25.2	17.2	21.4	37.3
Independent Undergraduates	18.0	14.0	18.1	12.5	14.5	17.0	15.6
Graduate Students	4.8	----	----	----	3.9	6.1	15.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[a]Excludes Guaranteed Student Loan program.

[b]All numbers pertaining to the SSIG recipients are inflated since many institutions were unable to report these recipients separately. The reported numbers include many students (more than half) who receive only state funds and no federal scholarship support.

Table 5

Characteristics of Participants in the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program (BEOG), by Type and Control of Institution, 1974-75
(In Percentages)

Characteristics	Total Institutions	Public Institutions				Private Institutions			
		Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University	Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University
Total	543,000	419,000	210,000	144,000	65,000	123,000	17,000	89,000	18,000
Ethnic Group									
Minority	48.1	49.2	54.7	48.3	34.0	44.0	31.2	44.9	51.4
Nonminority	52.0	50.8	45.3	51.7	66.0	56.0	68.8	55.1	48.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sex									
Female	54.5	55.2	57.0	54.4	50.8	52.4	47.9	54.7	44.8
Male	45.5	44.9	43.0	45.6	49.2	47.6	52.1	45.3	55.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Status									
Dependent Undergraduates									
Family Income									
Less than $7,500	53.5	54.4	53.3	58.2	50.5	50.1	48.4	50.2	51.3
$7,500 - $11,999	25.3	23.2	20.7	24.1	29.5	32.5	34.4	32.3	32.0
More than $11,999	7.3	6.6	4.7	7.9	9.9	9.8	9.0	9.7	11.3
Independent Undergraduates	14.0	15.9	21.3	9.8	10.1	7.6	8.3	7.8	5.5
Graduate Students	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6

Characteristics of Participants in the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program (SEOG), by Type and Control of Institution, 1974-75
(In Percentages)

Characteristics	Total Institutions	Public Institutions				Private Institutions			
		Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University	Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University
Total	350,000	241,000	74,000	109,000	57,000	109,000	7,000	86,000	16,000
Ethnic Group									
Minority	47.8	49.0	55.7	50.6	38.0	45.0	40.7	44.8	48.0
Nonminority	52.3	51.0	44.3	49.4	62.0	55.0	59.3	55.2	52.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sex									
Female	54.1	55.2	59.4	54.1	52.1	52.0	57.8	52.5	46.8
Male	45.9	44.9	40.6	45.9	47.9	48.0	42.2	47.5	53.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Status									
Dependent Undergraduates									
Family Income									
Less than $7,500	54.3	54.0	45.2	60.4	53.2	55.0	55.5	56.0	49.1
$7,500 - $11,999	22.4	19.2	15.0	19.8	23.8	29.1	25.9	28.2	35.8
More than $11,999	5.3	4.4	3.6	4.4	5.6	7.2	11.1	6.8	8.5
Independent Undergraduates	18.1	22.5	36.2	15.4	17.4	8.7	7.6	9.1	6.7
Graduate Students	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 7

Characteristics of Participants in the College Work-Study Program (CWS), by Type and Control of Institution, 1974-75
(In Percentages)

Characteristics	Total Institutions	Public Institutions				Private Institutions			
		Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University	Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University
Total	575,000	362,000	105,000	176,000	81,000	213,000	15,000	167,000	31,000
Ethnic Group									
Minority	32.6	34.7	44.6	32.4	27.2	29.1	30.5	28.2	33.1
Nonminority	67.5	65.4	55.4	67.7	72.8	71.0	69.5	71.8	67.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sex									
Female	54.0	55.0	57.3	54.8	52.5	52.3	46.2	53.7	47.2
Male	46.0	45.0	42.7	45.2	47.5	47.7	53.8	46.3	52.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Status									
Dependent Undergraduates									
Family Income									
Less than $7,500	38.5	41.2	44.9	42.4	33.8	33.6	47.8	33.7	26.4
$7,500 - $11,999	25.9	24.8	23.3	26.3	23.6	28.0	34.3	27.8	26.0
More than $11,999	17.2	10.9	8.3	11.8	12.5	28.4	13.2	29.0	32.1
Independent Undergraduates	14.5	19.1	23.5	16.1	20.0	6.3	4.7	6.7	5.0
Graduate Students	3.9	4.0	----	3.5	10.2	3.8	----	2.8	10.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 8

Characteristics of Participants in the National Direct Student Loan Program (NDSL), by Type and Control of Institution, 1974-75
(In Percentages)

Characteristics	Total Institutions	Public Institutions				Private Institutions			
		Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University	Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University
Total	749,000	425,000	59,000	210,000	157,000	324,000	17,000	241,000	66,000
Ethnic Group									
Minority	28.9	32.0	41.3	33.2	26.9	24.8	23.6	24.6	25.9
Nonminority	71.1	68.0	58.8	66.8	73.2	75.2	76.4	75.4	74.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sex									
Female	49.6	51.1	55.5	52.1	48.2	47.6	55.0	49.3	39.7
Male	50.4	48.9	44.5	47.9	51.8	52.4	45.0	50.7	60.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Status									
Dependent Undergraduates									
Family Income									
Less than $7,500	30.8	34.0	38.0	35.8	29.7	26.4	32.2	28.0	19.3
$7,500 - $11,999	24.7	23.5	17.3	25.0	24.1	26.3	26.8	27.6	21.6
More than $11,999	21.4	13.7	5.9	14.7	15.6	32.1	25.8	32.4	32.6
Independent Undergraduates	17.0	22.8	38.8	19.8	20.3	8.8	15.2	9.1	6.2
Graduate Students	6.1	6.0	----	4.6	10.3	6.4	----	2.8	20.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 9

Characteristics of Participants in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program (GSL), by Type and Control of Institution, 1974-75
(In Percentages)

Characteristics	Total Institutions	Public Institutions				Private Institutions			
		Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University	Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University
Total	669,000	377,000	35,000	184,000	158,000	292,000	9,000	187,000	95,000
Ethnic Group									
Minority	18.0	17.7	21.1	19.6	15.0	18.3	7.8	14.3	26.6
Nonminority	82.0	82.3	78.9	80.4	85.0	81.7	92.2	85.7	73.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Sex									
Female	45.8	47.1	47.0	49.9	44.1	44.3	39.3	46.3	40.7
Male	54.2	52.9	53.0	50.1	55.9	55.7	60.7	53.7	59.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Status									
Dependent Undergraduates									
Family Income									
Less than $7,500	13.5	14.8	18.1	16.9	12.1	11.8	22.3	11.9	10.8
$7,500 - $11,999	18.2	17.6	15.4	19.9	15.9	18.9	30.2	19.4	17.1
More than $11,999	37.3	33.0	18.9	36.2	32.8	42.7	40.6	50.9	26.4
Independent Undergraduates	15.6	22.0	47.6	17.8	21.1	7.5	7.0	7.7	7.1
Graduate Students	15.4	12.5	----	9.2	18.0	19.1	----	10.2	38.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 10

Mean Costs to Undergraduates of Attending Public and Private Institutions in 1974-75, by Selected Characteristics (In Dollars)[a]

Characteristics	Public		Private	
	Mean Undergraduate Tuition (in-state)	Mean Room & Board	Mean Undergraduate Tuition	Mean Room & Board
Total	$ 400	$ 990	$ 2,110	$ 1,230
Type				
Two-Year	300	920	1,700	1,180
Four-Year	550	1,060	2,170	1,230
University	620	1,230	2,620	1,440
Proportion of Students Receiving Need-Based Assistance				
Less than 20%	300	960	2,390	1,290
20% - 39%	400	1,000	2,350	1,320
40% - 59%	520	1,040	2,080	1,220
60% - 79%	540	950	2,030	1,170
80% - 100%	610	1,000	1,610	1,090

[a]Costs rounded to nearest ten dollars.

Table 11

Average Amount of Assistance Awarded Under Office of Education Assistance Programs, by Control and Type of Institution, 1974-75 (In Dollars)[a]

Institutional Characteristics	BEOG	SEOG	SSIG[b]	CWS	NDSL	GSL
Total	$ 620	$ 540	$ 600	$ 560	$ 690	$ 1,250
Control						
Public	610	490	490	600	630	1,190
Private	670	660	700	510	770	1,330
Type						
Public Two-Year	580	400	560	610	440	970
Private Two-Year	680	470	770	440	790	1,740
Public Four-Year	640	490	480	540	600	1,180
Private Four-Year	660	660	710	490	730	1,280
Public University	630	610	460	700	760	1,250
Private University	660	740	630	660	930	1,390

[a]Awards rounded to nearest ten dollars.

[b]All numbers pertaining to the SSIG recipients are inflated since many institutions were unable to report these recipients separately. The reported numbers include many students (more than half) who receive only state funds and no federal scholarship support.

Table 12

Source and Amount of Funds Available for Undergraduate and Graduate Students, by Type and Control of Institution, 1974-75 (In Percentages)

Source of Funds	Total Institutions	Public Institutions				Private Institutions			
		Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University	Total	Two-Year	Four-Year	University
Total Dollar Amount (in millions)	$3,926.8	$2,026.7	$ 349.8	$ 850.5	$ 826.4	$1,900.1	$ 78.8	$1,223.7	$ 597.6
Distribution:									
Federal Sources[a]	38.8	46.9	68.5	45.9	38.3	30.4	50.7	30.8	27.2
Institutional Sources:									
Direct	26.0	21.6	9.9	19.7	28.8	30.7	16.0	31.7	30.7
Tuition Waivers and Remissions	6.8	4.6	3.4	3.4	6.5	9.1	4.9	6.9	13.9
State and Local Government Sources	19.7	18.7	13.2	22.2	17.3	20.7	23.5	21.6	18.5
Private Donors	8.6	8.2	5.0	8.7	9.1	9.1	4.8	9.0	9.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[a]Not included are programs which are not part of the revenue or expenditure accounts of institutions, e.g., Veterans Educational Benefits, Social Security Student Benefits, Guaranteed Student Loans.

Table 13

Suggestions by Institutional Representatives of Changes in Federal Policy to Improve Student Assistance Programs, by Control of Institution

(Unweighted Numbers)

Suggestions	Total Institutions (N=230)	Public Institutions (N=100)	Private Institutions (N=130)
Total	456	224	232
Administrative			
Provide earlier notification of funding levels	62	25	37
Have common application forms and requirements for campus-based programs	43	23	20
Provide administrative allowance for noncampus-based programs	28	20	8
Process BEOG awards and payments more rapidly	22	13	9
Make fewer revisions in programs, but use more institutional input when revisions are necessary	17	7	10
Provide guidelines on a more timely basis	14	8	6
Eliminate distinction between initial and Continuing SEOG grants	12	6	6
Allow more autonomy for aid officers in determining most urgent aid needs	10	2	8
Other specific processing recommendations	10	4	6
Other specific administrative recommendations	26	11	15
Programmatic			
Make needs formula uniform for all programs	31	15	16
Provide easier transfer of funds between campus-based programs and allow carryover of funds	28	17	11
Other special interest group recommendations	20	14	6
Make needs formula more equitable	17	7	10
Eliminate various restrictions regarding work under CWS	17	11	6
Other needs formula recommendations	16	8	8
Provide more aid to middle income students	15	2	13
Put BEOG funds into the three campus-based programs	12	9	3
Maintain campus-based programs	12	5	7
Unify all programs	9	5	4
Other specific program recommendations	35	12	23

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL

March 31, 1975

Dear Higher Education Panel Representative:

Enclosed is the Higher Education Panel Survey #27 - Student Assistance Programs. As you may know, many changes in student aid legislation are now being considered in the Congress and elsewhere, and the results of this survey will be extremely useful.

We have field-tested each of the requested items and have revised the survey content to ease the reporting burden as much as possible. We know that for some institutions this survey may prove to be difficult because record-keeping practices and information systems vary greatly in different school settings. We hope to obtain as reliable information as possible, but we do recognize the necessity of sometimes providing estimates, especially for student aid programs such as work-study for which the figures are likely to increase throughout the school year.

We anticipate that you, the Panel Representative, will probably have to obtain much of the requested information from the student aid office at your institution during this busy time of the year. Needless to say, we are very grateful for your combined efforts to respond to this important survey in a timely fashion.

Please do your best to complete and return the survey form by April 18. A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience. As usual, please be assured that individual responses will be held in strict confidence and that results will be reported only by institutional groupings. We will send you the report on this survey as soon as it is completed.

Once again, thank you for your continuing support of the Higher Education Panel surveys. If you have any questions or problems with this survey, please do not hesitate to call us (collect) at 202-833-4757.

Sincerely,

Frank Atelsek

Frank Atelsek
Director

Higher Education Panel Survey Number 27
Student Assistance Programs

Instructions and Definitions

Question #1 - "Need-based" refers to assistance available to students on the basis of financial need. Do not count students receiving awards based only on scholastic merit or achievement.

Question #2 - "Tuition and Required Fees" - If your institution has tuition and fees differing on the basis of class, department, etc., please provide an average figure.

Question #3 - Have your estimate include grants, loans, work-study, fellowships, scholarships, and all other funds whose principal purpose is aiding students. Note the specific inclusions and exclusions listed below.

"Federal Sources" - Include Basic Educational Opportunity Grants. Do not include any programs which only indirectly involve your institution and are not part of the revenue or expenditure accounts of your institution (e.g., Veterans Educational Benefits, Social Security Student Benefits, Guaranteed Student Loans, State Student Incentive Grants, etc.).

"Tuition Waivers and Remissions" - Although institutional financial practices differ, tuition waivers and remissions are generally accounted for as a dollar amount in the institutional general fund contribution to student aid. For purposes of this question, account for waivers and remissions in this manner.

"State and Local Government Sources" - State and local government money for grants, loans, fellowships, assistantships, etc., whose principal purpose is aiding students.

Question #4 - Include both undergraduate and graduate students in data for ethnic group, sex, and average amount of award. As a check, you will note that, ideally, the total should be the same for sex, ethnic group, and graduate and undergraduate students.

Student Assistance Programs

BEOG - Basic Educational Opportunity Grants

SEOG - Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants

SSIG - State Student Incentive Grants

CWS - College Work-Study Program

NDSL - National Direct Student Loans

GSL - Federally Guaranteed Student Loans

"Minority Students" include U.S. citizens who are:

1) Blacks/Negroes

2) American Indians

3) Asian Americans

4) Spanish-surnamed Americans (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Latin Americans)

Instructions and Definitions (Continued)

Question #4 (continued)

"Family Income" is the gross, unadjusted income of the student family under consideration, as used in the college-based financial aid program.

"Independent Student" (as defined by IRS) is a student who either:

1) Has not or will not be claimed as an exemption by any person except his or her spouse for the calendar year in which aid is requested; or

2) Has not received and will not receive financial assistance of more than $600 from his or her parents.

Please leave no empty spaces. If the number of students in a particular category is zero, put "0" in the appropriate space. If the information is unavailable, or unavailable in the form requested, so indicate in the appropriate space.

We expect some institutions will not be able to fully complete this table, particularly the unduplicated counts. Please do not spend an inordinate amount of time and effort obtaining unduplicated counts if they are not reasonably accessible to you.

Use estimates if actual data are not available, but label them as estimates.

OMB No. 99-R0265. Exp. 6/75

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL SURVEY NUMBER 27

Student Assistance Programs

1. Approximately what percentage of your full-time undergraduate student body is receiving some form of need-based* student assistance?

_____%

2. Please indicate 1974-75 student charges for full-time undergraduates at your institution for the following:

Tuition and Required Fees* (in-state) $_____

Room and Board at your institution $_____

3. What is the approximate dollar amount* of all student aid resources available this year at your institution for both undergraduate and graduate students (include student aid grants, loans, work-study, etc.)?

$_____

Of this total, about what percentage comes:

a) From Federal sources* _____%

b) From general funds at your institution

1) Given directly (in the form of grants, loans, work-study, etc.) _____%

2) Given in the form of tuition waivers and remissions* _____%

c) From state and local government sources* _____%

d) From private donors (money restricted to student aid, via scholarships, loans, etc.) _____%

100%

*See Instructions and Definitions

4. Estimated Number of Aid Recipients by Selected Characteristics, 1974-75

Characteristics	BEOG	SEOG	SSIG	CWS	NDSL	GSL	Total Unduplicated Count (excluding GSL)
Total							
Ethnic Group							
Minority							
Nonminority							
Sex							
Female							
Male							
"Dependent" Undergraduates By Family Income:							
Less than $7,500							
$7,500 - $11,999							
$12,000 or more							
Independent Undergraduates							
Graduate Students (Dependent and Independent)	XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXX				
Average Amount of Award							XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

5. Apart from increasing funding levels, what major change(s) or modification(s) in federal policy would best contribute to improving student assistance at your institution?

Thank you for your assistance.
Please return this form by April 18, 1975.

TO: HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

PLEASE RETAIN A COPY OF THIS SURVEY FOR YOUR RECORDS

Person Completing Form _____

Office _____

Phone _____

Appendix B: Weighting Procedures

Weighting Procedures

The survey instrument was mailed to the entire membership of the Higher Education Panel (N=644). By the deadline (June 30, 1975), 505 institutions (78.8 percent) had provided usable returns.

The data reported by respondents were statistically adjusted to represent the total population of 3,021 colleges and universities in the United States. To develop these national estimates, each data item was weighted, within each stratification cell, by the ratio of the number of institutions in the eligible population to the number of Panel institutions in that cell which responded to that particular item.

Four separate populations were used in weighting the responses to this survey. Data related to all students or all institutions were weighted up to the entire population. For items related solely to undergraduates (e.g., #1), the population dropped to 2,864 institutions, eliminating the 157 institutions which have no undergraduate enrollment. Likewise, for items related solely to graduate students (e.g., #4, row 10), the population included only those 1,059 institutions which enroll graduate students. Finally, for the questions about the State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) program in item #4, a population was defined to include only those institutions located in states which participated in the SSIG program.

Weights were computed separately to allow for differential item response. The resulting cell and item weights were applied to the responses of each institution. The weighted data were then aggregated into broad institutional categories appropriate to the survey analysis.

The reader is reminded that all data displayed in Tables 2 through 12 represent independently computed population estimates. Because each data element was weighted separately, subtotals generally approximate, but may not add up to, their corresponding totals.

Table B-1

Stratification Design:
Distribution by Current Enrollment[a] of Population
Panel, and Respondents

Cell Number	Enrollment Category	Population (N=3021)	Panel (N=644)	Respondents (N=505)
	Public Universities	96	89	73
1	<13,300	25	22	19
2	13,300-18,999	23	20	15
3	19,000-24,000	23	23	20
4	>24,000	25	24	19
	Private Universities	66	56	43
5	<6,000	17	12	9
6	6,000-8,899	17	15	10
7	8,900-13,100	15	13	12
8	>13,100	17	16	12
	Public Four-Year Colleges	411	95	79
9	< 2,800	151	23	16
10	2,800-6,099	120	21	19
11	6,100-11,500	89	27	23
12	>11,500	51	24	21
	Private Nonsectarian Four-Year Colleges	504	106	88
13	< 975	302	29	25
14	975-1,399	66	24	20
15	1,400-2,300	63	26	21
16	>2,300	73	27	22
	Private Catholic Four-Year Colleges	257	63	51
17	< 750	124	15	11
18	750-1,199	58	21	17
19	1,200-1,700	30	9	9
20	>1,700	45	18	14
	Private Other Sectarian Four-Year Colleges	436	106	82
21	< 800	244	31	27
22	800-1,199	74	22	15
23	1,200-1,700	57	24	17
24	>1,700	61	25	23
	Public Two-Year Colleges	888	61	45
25	<1,900	506	19	16
26	1,900-2,799	105	13	10
27	2,800-5,700	140	12	6
28	>5,700	137	17	13
	Private Two-Year Colleges	248	35	22
29	< 500	171	18	12
30	≥ 500	77	17	10
	Black Four-Year Colleges	87	24	16
31	<1,100	38	13	7
32	≥1,100	49	11	9
	Black Two-Year Colleges	16	5	3
33	< 500	8	3	2
34	≥ 500	8	2	1
	Independent Medical Schools	12	8	3
35	< 1,000	8	4	1
36	≥ 1,000	4	4	2

[a] Data based on 1973-74 current enrollment reported in the Office of Education's Education Directory 1973-74.

Table B-2

Number of Institutions in the Population for HEP Survey #27, Student Assistance: Participants and Programs, 1974-75 by Selected Characteristics

Characteristics	Population[a]	Panel	Respondents
Total	3,021	644	505
Control			
Public	1,443	260	205
Private	1,578	384	300
Type and Control			
Public Two-Year Colleges[b]	894	63	46
Private Two-Year Colleges[b]	258	38	24
Public Four-Year Colleges	453	108	86
Private Four-Year Colleges	1,253	289	232
Public Universities	96	89	73
Private Universities	67	57	44
Undergraduate Enrollment (1973-74)[c]			
<1,000	1,231	158	114
1,000-4,999	853	263	206
5,000-9,999	308	92	77
>9999	341	131	108

[a]Survey population includes only those institutions listed in the Education Directory 1973-74.

[b]Because the extremely low representation of two-year colleges in this survey (5 percent of public, 9 percent of private), caution should be exercised in interpreting the data relative to them.

[c]Population numbers for this category do not total 3,021 because (1) 157 institutions have no undergraduate enrollments, and (2) HEGIS enrollment data are not available for 131 institutions.

Appendix C: Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents

Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents

The survey questionnaires were mailed to all 644 institutions in the Panel. Three service academies were subsequently excluded from consideration because their students are supported wholly by federal funds. Of the remaining 641 institutions, usable responses were received from 505, or 78.8 percent, before the deadline for return of questionnaires.

Table C-1 presents a comparison of respondents and nonrespondents to the survey, together with response rates by various institutional characteristics.

In general, respondents closely resembled nonrespondents, particularly with respect to control of institution. The higher response rates, however, occurred among (1) public universities and four-year colleges (82 percent); (2) institutions located in the West (86 percent); and (3) institutions with large undergraduate enrollments, particularly between five and ten thousand students (84 percent).

Response rates were lower than expected for (1) two-year colleges, particularly private two-year colleges (63 percent); (2) colleges and universities located in the South (74 percent); and (3) institutions with fewer than 1,000 undergraduates (73 percent).

Table C-1

Comparison of Respondents and Nonrespondents to Survey #27
Student Assistance: Participants and Programs, 1974-75
(In Percentages)

Characteristics	Respondents (N=505)	Nonrespondents (N=136)	Response Rate
Control			
Public	40.6	38.2	79.8
Private	59.4	61.8	78.1
Type & Control			
Public Two-Year	9.1	12.5	73.0
Private Two-Year	4.8	10.3	63.2*
Public Four-Year	17.0	14.0	81.9
Private Four-Year	45.9	41.9	80.3
Public University	14.5	11.8	82.0
Private University	8.7	9.6	77.2
Census Region			
East	27.0	28.9	77.7
North Central	29.2	25.2	81.2
South	27.8	36.3	74.1
West	15.9	9.6	86.0
Undergraduate Enrollment (1973-74)			
Less than 1,000	22.6	30.9	73.1
1,000-4,999	40.8	41.2	78.6
5,000-9,999	15.2	11.0	83.7
10,000 and more	21.4	16.9	82.4

* Response rate falls short of the overall response rate by more than 10 percent.

Other Reports of the Higher Education Panel
American Council on Education

Blandford, B. and Dutton, D. **Survey of First-Year Graduate and Postdoctoral Enrollment in Science and Engineering.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 1, August, 1971.

Blandford, B. and Dutton, D. **Research Support for Science Faculty.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 2, November, 1971.

Astin, A., Blandford, B., and Mahn, T. **Freshman Class Vacancies in Fall 1971 and Recent Trends in Enrollment of Minority Freshmen.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 3, February, 1972.

Changes in Graduate Programs in Science and Engineering 1970–72 and 1972–1974. Science Resources Studies Highlights. Washington: National Science Foundation, July, 1972.

Blandford, B. and Sell, C. **Enrollment of Junior-Year Students (1970 and 1971).** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 5, April, 1972.

Trexler, J. and Blandford, B. **What College Presidents Are Reading.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 6, March, 1972.

Trexler, J. and Kent, L. **Commercial Theme-Writing Services.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 7, June, 1972.

Furniss, W. T. **Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems: Current Practice.** ACE Special Report, July, 1972.

Bayer, A. E. and Astin, A. W. **War Protest on U.S. Campuses During April, 1972.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 9, May, 1972.

Blandford, B. A. and Trexler, J. C. **Expected First-Year Graduate Enrollment in Science and Engineering, Fall 1972.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 10, August, 1972.

Blandford, B. A. **Student Participation on Institutional Governing Boards.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 11, October, 1972.

Dutton, J. E. and Blandford, B. A. **Enrollment of Junior-Year Students (1971 and 1972).** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 12, April, 1973.

Dutton, J. E. **Courses and Enrollment in Ethnic/Racial Studies.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 14, August, 1973.

Dutton, J. E. and Jenkins, M. D. **The Urban Involvement of Colleges and Universities.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 15, August, 1973.

Dutton, J. E. and El-Khawas, E. H. **Production of Doctorates in Selected Fields, 1972–1975.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 16, April, 1974.

Dutton, J. E. **First-Year Enrollment for Masters or Higher Degrees, Fall 1973.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 17, April, 1974.

El-Khawas, E. H. and Kinzer, J. L. **The Impact of Office of Education Student Assistance Programs, Fall 1973.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 18, April, 1974.

El-Khawas, E. H. and Kinzer, J. L. **Enrollment of Minority Graduate Students at Ph.D. Granting Institutions.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 19, August, 1974.

El-Khawas, E. H. **College and University Facilities: Expectations of Space and Maintenance Needs for Fall 1974.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 20, September, 1974.

Kinzer, J. L. and El-Khawas, E. H. **Compensation Practices for Graduate Research Assistants: A Survey of Selected Doctoral Institutions.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 21, October, 1974.

El-Khawas, E. H. and Furniss, W. T. **Faculty Tenure and Contract Systems: 1972 and 1974.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 22, December, 1974.

El-Khawas, E. H. and Kinzer, J. L. **A Survey of Continuing Education Opportunities Available to Nonacademic Scientists, Engineers and Mathematicians,** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 23, April, 1975.

Atelsek, Frank J. and Gomberg, Irene L. **Nonfederal Funding of Biomedical Research and Development: A Survey of Doctoral Institutions.** Higher Education Panel Report, No. 25, July 1975.

Single copies of the above reports may be obtained from the Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.